

**To:** Horst Greczmiel[Horst\_Greczmiel@ceq.eop.gov]  
**From:** Goforth, Kathleen  
**Sent:** Wed 9/3/2014 9:59:43 PM  
**Subject:** BDCP Alternatives table

::  
 ,,  
 Horst –

Following up on our phone conversation this morning, I thought the table below, which was prepared by my staff, might be helpful to you in visualizing how the BDCP Draft EIS alternatives are structured. Unfortunately for the DEIS reader, no such table is provided in the DEIS, itself.

As you know, the BDCP is a Habitat Conservation Plan for the Bay Delta, prepared to support an application for a 50-year “take” permit, under the Endangered Species Act, to modify and continue operating the State Water Project, along with the Central Valley Project. The Draft EIS evaluates the potential implementation of the BDCP, which covers over 50 species -- most notably, endangered salmon and smelt. There are 22 Conservation Measures included as an HCP package. Conservation Measure 1 (referred to in our letter as CM1) is a type of conveyance structure (above-ground canal or underground tunnel, depending on the alternative) that would convey water through the estuary. Various operational scenarios are associated with the different alignments and conveyance structures. Conservation Measures 2 through 10 are the habitat restoration and environmental stressor reduction aspects of the HCP. For example, CM2 is restoration within Yolo Bypass; CM4 is tidal restoration; other CMs pertain to reduction of stressors such as predation, illegal harvest, etc. The document is a combined NEPA/CEQA document and purports to analyze the conveyance structures (CM1) at a project level and the other Conservation Measures at a programmatic level.

The Conservation Measures are grouped together in various combinations to create the Alternatives. Each Alternative is a combination of various alignments, operations, and restoration measures. Alternative 4 is the **CEQA** preferred alternative. The Draft EIS does **not** identify a NEPA preferred alternative. There are 15 different alternatives. The table below summarizes the components of each Alternative:

Alternative	Capacity (cfs)	Use Existing South Delta Pumps?	CM1 Conveyance Facility	Operational Scenario	Restoration CM2-22	% Change (in future in Exports conditions)	% Change in Exports
1A	15,000	Y	pipeline/tunnel	A	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	23%	6%
1B	15,000	Y	east canal	A	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	23%	6%
1C	15,000	Y	west canal and pipeline tunnel	A	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	23%	6%
2A	15,000	Y	pipeline/tunnel	B Reverse OMR Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	14%	-1%

2B	15,000	Y	east canal	B Reverse OMR Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	14%	-1%
2C	15,000	Y	west canal and pipeline tunnel	B Reverse OMR Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	14%	-1%
3	6,000	Y	pipeline/tunnel	A	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	21%	4%
4	9,000	Y	modified pipeline/tunnel	H1, H2, H3, H4 Reverse OMR	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	18% 6% 11% -1%	2% -8% 4% -14%
5	3,000	Y	pipeline/tunnel	C Fall X2	<b>25,000 ac tidal;</b> 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	8%	-7%
6A	15,000	N	pipeline/tunnel	D Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	-15%	-27%
6B	15,000	N	east canal	D Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	-15%	-27%
6C	15,000	N	west canal and pipeline tunnel	D Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	-15%	-27%
7	9,000	Y	pipeline/tunnel	E Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; <b>20,000 ac floodplain; 40 mi linear channel</b>	-15%	-27%
8	9,000	Y	pipeline/tunnel	F Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	-30%	-40%
9	15,000	Y	channels through delta	G Fall X2	65,000 ac tidal; 10,000 ac floodplain; 20 mi linear channel	-1%	-15%

I hope this is helpful. Feel free to call if you have any additional questions.

-Kathy

Kathleen Martyn Goforth, Manager

Environmental Review Section

EPA Region 9 (ENF-4-2)

75 Hawthorne Street

San Francisco, CA 94105

415-972-3521